

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Non-Final Office Action dated August 3, 2009, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: The recitation of “pasteif” in line 18 should be deleted.

Claims 16 and 21~23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 16 and 21~23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0024628 to *Walker* (hereinafter “*Walker*”), in view of United States Patent No. 5,292,368 to *Komine* (hereinafter “*Komine*”). Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker* as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 61-055625 to *Yamamoto* (hereinafter “*Yamamoto*”). Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker* as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2001/0013920 to *Hashimoto* (hereinafter “*Hashimoto*”).

Claims 16 and 21~22 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11 and 13 of copending Application No. 10/691,662.

Claim 23 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10~11 and 13~15 of copending Application No. 10/691,662 in view of *Hashimoto*.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

With this response, claim 16 has been amended. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, claims 16 and 21~23 are currently pending in this application with claims 1~15 and 24~28 having been withdrawn in response to the Examiner's requirement for restriction.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

First of all, claim 16 has been amended to address the Examiner's objections, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection in light of this amendment.

Claim 16 has been amended to comply with the written description requirement and to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 16 and 21~23 fully comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, and respectfully requests that these rejections will be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker*, in view of *Komine*. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker* as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of *Yamamoto*. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Walker* as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of *Hashimoto*.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 16 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 16 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "providing a plurality of first dispensers for forming a silver dot and a plurality of second dispensers for forming a seal pattern", "supplying silver paste to the plurality of first dispensers including a plurality of first syringes and sealant to the plurality of second dispensers including a plurality of second syringes, wherein the first dispensers are formed on one side of the tables and the second dispensers are formed on the other side of the tables" and "supplying silver paste to the substrates having a plurality of unit panels through first nozzles at the end of the first syringes and sealant to the substrates through second nozzles at the end of the second syringes".

As described in the present invention, when a dispenser for seal pattern and a dispenser for silver dot are respectively formed at both sides of one table, a seal process and a silver dot process may be performed all in the same apparatus, and accordingly processing steps may be reduced in comparison with a case performing the sealing process and the silver process separately.

However, none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggestions at least the aforementioned features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is allowable over the cited references.

Accordingly, claim 16 and claim 21, which depends either directly or indirectly upon claim 16, are allowable over *Walker*, in view of *Komine*. Moreover, claim 22, which depends either directly or indirectly upon claim 16, is allowable over *Walker*, and further in view of *Yamamoto*. Claim 23, which depends either directly or indirectly upon claim 16, is allowable over *Walker*, and further in view of *Hashimoto*.

Claims 16~22 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10~11 and 13~15 of copending Application No. 10/691,662.

Claim 23 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10~11 and 13~15 of copending Application No. 10/691,662 in view of *Hashimoto*.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections in light of amendment of claim 16.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: November 2, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Valerie P. Hayes/

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant